

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,178	01/27/2004	Munroe Chirnomas	01PA20AUS01	3588
25893	7590 04/21/2005		EXAM	INER
LAWRENCE C. EDELMAN, IP COUNSEL FASTCORP			CRAWFORD, GENE O	
	/ER AVE, B-2 AINS, NJ 07950		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3651	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s) CHIRNOMAS, MUNROE	
D	10/766,178 Examiner		
Response to Rule 312 Communication		Art Unit	
	Gene O. Crawford	3651	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addre	
. ☑ The amendment filed on <u>25 October 2004</u> under 37 CF	R 1.312 has been considered,	and has been:	

and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) disapproved. See explanation below.

e) entered in part. See explanation below.

The amendment is not entered because it is directed to matters affecting the scope of the invention that was claimed and thus deemed patentable. As stated in the examiner's reasons for allowance "the second computer being preprogrammed to at least partially disable the first computer" is not taught or fairly suggested by the prior art. The aforementioned recitation is vastly different from the first computer being preprogrammed to disable itself. While the specification is enabling with respect to the preprogramming of the first computer to disable itself applicant did not claim as much. Claims 22-30 would

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1)

b) entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

at least partially disable the first computer" is not taught or fairly suggested by the prior art. The aforementioned recitation is vastly different from the first computer being preprogrammed to disable itself. While the specification is enabling with respect to the preprogramming of the first computer to disable itself applicant did not claim as much. Claims 22-30 would require a search for elements that were not under consideration during the initial search of claims 1-21. With regard to claim 19, the examiner interprets the claim to read the second computer being capable of providing an enable code to override the disabling by the second computer. Applicant is reminded that no amendment may be made as a matter of right after the mailing of the notice of allowance. However, applicant is free to file a divisional or a continuation application to clear up the matters for which he is concerned.

Gene O. Crawford Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3651

